

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 11-14 and 20 are amended by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Schofield et al. (U.S. Patent 5,796,094, herein “Schofield”); Claims 1-3, 14-16 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hemming (U.S. Patent 4,218,683); Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hemming; and Claims 23 and 24 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the antecedent basis is corrected, and the terms “wave reflecting element,” at line 3 of Claim 7 and at lines 1-2 of Claim 20 are replaced with the term “wave reception element,” respectively. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the personal interview granted to Applicants’ attorney on April 13, 2004, and the indication that Claims 23 and 24 include allowable subject matter. During the interview, the presently submitted claim amendments and arguments in support of the claims’ patentability were presented. In particular, in light of Figures 1-3, it was pointed out that Schofield and Hemming fail to disclose the physical relationship of the elements of the claimed probe device.

The Examiner indicated that the rejection of Claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Schofield has now been withdrawn. With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-3, 14-16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hemming, the Examiner maintained his position, and suggested further amendment of Claims 1 and 14 to

clearly recite the physical relationship of the claimed elements, or to recite functional languages to better distinguish over the Hemming reference.

Applicants therefore amend independent Claim 1 to recite that "... waves emitted by said antenna under test are reflected away from said probe mount by said reflective screen such that said waves do not impinge upon said probe mount," to include functional features of the claimed probe device. Independent Claim 14 includes similar features. Amended Claims 1 and 14 find support at page 10, lines 12-15 of the specification, for example. The claims are also amended to better correspond to U.S. claim drafting practice. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that a test antenna 14 (e.g., corresponding to the claimed wave reception element) of Hemming inherently must have a support means (e.g., corresponding to the claimed support and the claimed probe mount). Further, Hemming discloses a dielectric lens 16 (e.g., corresponding to the claimed screen) that converts spherical wave fronts 18 radiating from an antenna 12 (e.g., corresponding to the claimed antenna under test/electromagnetic source) to plane wave fronts 20. The plane wave fronts 20 are received by the test antenna 14 (see column 7, line 65 to, column 8, line 13, and Figure 1). The dielectric lens 16 appears to impinge the spherical wave fronts 18 upon the test antenna 14 and upon the support mentioned by the Examiner (the support is located in a vicinity of the test antenna 14 in light of the Examiner's response to Applicants' argument filed September 15, 2003), and Applicants respectfully submit that Hemming does not disclose or suggest that the dielectric lens 16 reflects the spherical wave fronts 18 away from the support such that the wave fronts 18 do not impinge upon the support.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom define over Hemming.


Consequently, in light of the prior indication of allowable subject matter, the discussion held during the interview and the above discussion, and in view of the present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorneys of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

EHK/SNS/GS:mda  
I:\ATTY\GS\19s\193337\AME FINAL.DOC